



JUN 27 2007

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) Q137-US7
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____	Application Number 10/665,440	Filed September 17, 2003
First Named Inventor David M. Skinlo		
Art Unit 1745	Examiner Dah Wei D. Yuan	

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified patent application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request if being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant/inventor.

Signature

assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Travis Dodd
Typed or printed name

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 42,491

818-833-2003

Telephone number

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____

06/14/2007

Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.

Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 37 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



PATENT
Docket No. Q137-US7

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

David M. Skinlo

Serial No: 10/665,440

Filed: September 17, 2003

For: ELECTRIC STORAGE BATTERY
CONSTRUCTION AND METHOD OF
MANUFACTURE

Art Unit: 1745

Examiner: YUAN, Dah Wei D.

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed on April 12, 2007 (the Office Action). Pending claims 66-79 are rejected under 35 USC 112 for allegedly omitting a critical feature. The Applicant submits that a clear legal error has been committed in rejecting claims 66-79 for omitting an allegedly critical feature.

REMARKS

A. The Pending Claims

Claim 66 is the only pending independent claim. Claim 66 is directed to a method of constructing an electric storage battery. The method includes positioning an electrode assembly in a case. The electrode assembly includes a first electrode strip and a second electrode strip wound around a pin so as to form a spiral roll. The pin is in electrical communication with the first electrode strip. The method also includes fastening a first end cap to the case such that the pin extends through the first end cap. The method also includes fastening a second end cap to the case such that a tab provides electrical communication between the second electrode strip and the second cap.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC §112

Claims 66-79 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. In particular, the Office Action argues that the ““electrically conductive terminal pin being electrically insulated from the case’ is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim, is not enabled by the disclosure.” Claim 66 does specify a pin in electrical communication with the first electrode strip and extending through the first end cap but does not specify that the pin is electrically insulated from the case. Accordingly, this rejection appears to be an argument that insulation of the pin from the case is essential to the operation of the claimed method.

In support of this rejection, the Office Action cites *In re Mayhew* which is discussed in MPEP §2164.08(c). MPEP §2164.08(c) addresses enablement when an allegedly critical feature is not claimed and is accordingly central to this rejection.

This rejection stems from an improper application of the law in MPEP §2164.08(c). The specification must teach that that insulation of the pin from the case is critical in order to support an enablement rejection under MPEP §2164.08(c). For instance, MPEP §2164.08(c) states that “(a) feature which is **taught as critical in a specification** and is not recited in the claims should result in a rejection of such claim under the enablement” (emphasis added). This same section of the MPEP also provides that this rejection “should be made **ONLY** when **the language of the specification** makes it clear that the limitation is critical for the invention to function as intended” (emphasis added). Accordingly, the specification must teach that the allegedly missing material is critical in order for this law to apply. Since the pending Office Action alleges that insulation of the pin from the case is critical, the specification must teach that that insulation of the pin from the case is critical in order for MPEP §2164.08(c) to be properly applied.

The Applicant’s specification provides an example where the pin is insulated from the case, however, the specification does not teach that insulation of the pin from the case is critical to the operation of the battery. For instance, neither the Abstract, the Summary, the Drawings, nor the Background state that insulation of the pin from the case is critical to the claimed method. **Further, the specification actually contemplates embodiments where the pin need not be insulated from the case.** For instance, the Summary of the invention provides that the “battery case itself generally functions as the other battery terminal” at page

3, line 19-20. The use of the term “generally” teaches that the case does not always function as the other battery terminal. If the case does not function as the other terminal, then it is not critical or essential for the pin to be electrically insulated from the case because the battery will not short when the pin is in electrical communication with the case. Since the specification does not teach that it is critical for the pin to be electrically insulated from the case, MPEP §2164.08(c) provides that rejection for lack of enablement is not supported. Accordingly, the claims need not specify that the pin is electrically insulated from the case and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that legal error has been made by rejecting the pending claims for statutory double-patenting. For these reasons, allowance of claims 66-79 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



TRAVIS DODD
Reg. No. 42,491
Agent for Applicant(s)

Quallion LLC
P.O. Box 923127
Sylmar, CA 91392-3127
818-833-2003 ph
818-833-2065 fax
travisd@quallion.com